

ional and social progress—a union of masters and men for mutual advantage, not the union of class against class. Earnestly we implore the body of operatives to reconsider and withdraw their unwise demands; and, if it be not too late, we would with equal earnestness implore the masters to pause yet a short time longer before throwing 100,000 pennons out of bread, poisoning alike the innocent and the offending.

ARCHITECTURE AND HER OFFICES.*

In showing how Architecture is adapted to preserve the other arts, not alone without injury, but also with benefit to herself, we may glance at the analogy between them. All they have in common depends upon the perfection of the sight from continued observation of nature in her forms and effects: from this observation arises, in all, the facility of comparing works of art with nature, or with that remembrance of it of which the observing mind always retains a strong impression, storing up some idea of beauty, grace, or grandeur which it afterwards strives to reproduce. The minds of different artists gather then a similar idea, possess a similar type or standard from which to work, and the result will be that the several beauties expressed by each will harmonize, especially when employed for a common object, and will produce in union one transcendent beauty, attainable by not one of them alone. To sculpture belongs exact observation, intimate acquaintance with beauty,—to painting, harmony, perspective, proportion, knowledge of colour and effect; and true architecture must also possess these, even though she avoided adorning herself with the actual works of the other two. But if perfect in her own development she expresses the principles of the others in her peculiar work; and, consequently, when these three graces stand together, they are at once seen and felt in grace to harmonise, because of this secret community of principles on which they are formed. But, to enter more fully into the question of connection between the arts, there is a greater analogy, theoretically considered, between architecture, poetry, and music than between architecture, painting, and sculpture. We have seen that the connection between the two latter and our subject rests,—as on their in common being arts of design,—so on the exercise of certain things necessary to the right practice of each, such as study of nature, accurate observation, and the like. "Language," says M. Legrand, "refined from that in common use, and subjected to rhythm and regulated metres, often allowing of musical imitation of sounds, grace, beauty, grandeur of imagery, expression so chosen as most directly to appeal to the soul, proportion of details to each other and the whole, that whole gradually growing upon the understanding with one complete effect of many combined charms—and the object too often forgotten, of pleasing only the better to instruct,—these constitute the attractions of poetry." Music results from sounds combined, like the words in poetry, in similar measures; from expression of moral situations by means of accents descriptive of nature; from the combination of these accents in one skillful harmony; from an imitation of natural sounds and illustration of words, with various results, but which still operate more or less on the soul through the sense of hearing; from similar relative proportions to be observed, and rightly, from the same object as poetry. If in the above accounts we substitute material parts for words and sounds, we shall nearly arrive at the theory of architecture. Architecture consists of material parts, their arrangement in accordance with the laws of proportion and taste; divisions regularly repeated through the extent of the works with due respect, as in poetry and music, to each other and the whole; delight and astonishment produced by the expression of the ideas (as before) of grandeur, beauty, and grace; the continual satisfaction of

the soul through the sense of sight, and (as I think) the same object of pleasing only the better to instruct. Architecture, we repeat, consists of these. Whence it appears there is a complete theoretic analogy between poetry, music, and architecture, and partial analogy between each of them and sculpture and painting; and, taking them altogether, the principles upon which each is founded are so similar, that he who is thoroughly a master of one would find little difficulty in understanding and following the others, as has been done by many a great Italian. It results, then, that to be rightly a preserver of the other arts, so as not only not to detract from but to enhance their effect, the art we treat of should look to maintain her analogy with them, in herself following the true principles of universal art, from which thing alone can there arise a harmony between herself and the other two. The claim, then, in her office of preserver is, that she be true to herself. And though I deny that they are absolutely necessary to her efficiency, she would indeed be very austere without them—and lonely as a muse who has lost her sisters; and because they are protected by her, I assume their powers to be in some measure due to her, and bound to her service; and therefore what they declare in her, I shall say she declares; what they chronicle in her, she chronicles; what they attest in her, she attests.

Having seen the analogy between architecture and poetry, let us enter into a brief inquiry as to how far the former may be carried out on the principles of the latter, and let us endeavour to show how we can effect the poetry of architecture, so much debated about. On a former occasion I took a baptistery for the purpose of illustrating this matter: treating that as an embodiment of the ideas of purification, commencement, and promise, we made it a place of the dawn—we filled it with a dawn-light—we adorned it with the buds, and not the full-blown flowers. I will now take as a subject upon which some have been lately meditating—a marine palace. We have, then, to do with the sea. Now, the poets, in treating of any subject, not only endeavour to describe it by simple expression, but they aim at illustrating it in the very construction, the ornament and sound of their lines. The instances of this are almost innumerable, such as the *χιε πολυχηρα ρωγην* of Homer's nightingale—his passage of Neptune over the sea—his description of the speed of race-horses, which we can bear, for instance, in the line

αυκινά μάλ' ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθω δεικνύει ἡδὲ φεβεσθαι;
many similar passages in Virgil; the whole of Milton's "Battle in Heaven," in such expressions as "down their idle weapons dropt," where we almost see the arms fall, and, before, in "sonorous metal blowing martial sounds," where we hear the trumpets; the rush of passages ending like that with "invulnerable, impenetrably armed;" the lines in the "Penseroso," descriptive of the sound of the distant bell—

"Over some wide-watered shore,
Swinging slow with sullen roar;"

Dante's description of the confused sounds in hell, beginning—"Diverse lingue, orribili favelle;"—all these exemplify the truth of the observation, that there is not mere verbal description attempted, but actual description of facts in the construction of the lines, and close imitation of nature. With respect to the sea, the same thing nearly always occurs; as, for instance, in Homer, *ἢ δ' ἄσπευ' ἀπὰ θύρα πολυλαοβότον θαλαίης;*—in Byron's

"Roll on, thou deep and dark blue ocean, roll!"

and more wonderfully than anywhere, in Schiller's "Diver." As to the ornament, poets choose in this case their metaphors and illustrations from the things of the sea, and those connected with it, as, in the passage of Byron above quoted, he calls ships "oak leviathans," not oak elephants, and speaks of men sinking into the sea "like a drop of rain." These are not so much instances of mere imitation of sound, so complete in music and in "Israel in Egypt," but of expression of action; of adaptation of the work to the subject.

Now, we cannot make the ear have any

thing to do with architecture, but there is a vast power of appealing to the eye; and I claim a similar regard for what hath been shown to be given to the ear. I should like a marine palace to look as if it had been founded by Neptune and adorned by the sea nymphs. Let us consider. The sea gives us the idea of vastness, boldness,—the coast (I take some part of our own) of severity, ruggedness; the sea and coast viewed together impress us with the notion of grandeur. We will not, then, think of building what we call a pretty palace, nor of florid style, nor of fristered ornament. We will have a style in accordance with the ideas we have gathered from the place. We want a grand disposition of masses, severity, solidity. We are going to build in the very face of the ocean,—our base naturally buffeted with the waves, our summit by the hurricane. Now I say, if we observe all these things, imbuing our minds with the spirit of the place we are going to build in, we carry out in our main design the poetry of architecture. As to the ornament, it should be vocal of the sea. If ever dolphins and shells are justifiable, they are so here: they belong to the place. Those only who have studied it can imagine what an infinity of beautiful things there is in the deep,—what graceful foliage, what lovely coralline trees. Under the sway of those resistless tides wave groves glorious with all that is exquisite in design. The plants of the sea (for instance, that commonly known as *maiden's hair*), are of the finest and most delicate sort; its smaller inhabitants and their shells of every variety of form. Surely, then, in the marine palace, we shall not be compelled to have no foliage but such as grows on the land; no ornament but such as the forms of the country suggest. Our capitals may find another leaf than the acanthus; our carving another elaboration than that given to the vine and the ivy. We are going to build before Neptune, and are bound to consult him. Our palace is to stand between the sea and the earth, and it should equally declare the wonders of both. If this be done, we carry thoroughly out that kind of expression which is achieved, even in words only, by the poet; we realise the poetry of architecture; we erect a palace that does belong to the ocean; that is marine, in another and truer sense, than that of being merely taken up, like Aladdin, by some ghoul of prejudice from somewhere far in the interior, far from the sea, and clumsily dropped upon the coast.

But to resume. Architecture having called upon Painting and Sculpture to beautify her by the addition of their graces, and then having availed herself of them, at once assumed several new and important offices in their name. For men naturally asked, "What shall we paint, and what shall we sculpture?" What could they do? Either simply imitate nature, or depict their manners, and illustrate their history. If in the temple, depict the story of the gods and heroes; if in the public hall, the actions of their ancestors. It is said they were ignorant of landscape painting, and what other painting there was has perished: the sculpture remains to tell us with what success men achieved the objects they had in view. The temple soon enshrined its sculptured god: its walls probably displayed his painted myths; the revelation in colours of his attributes and creed. And thus architecture assumed another office—she became a witness of religion—she handed down the faith of nations to their posterity—the same Minerva sat calmly in the temple as sat there before—the same Jove frowned with marble brows and menaced with his dreaded thunder, as frowned and menaced of old, when art first made him. It is a duty of your art to witness and commemorate the faith of the people among whom it is cherished. It is right that the temple should itself be a Bible in stone, an unalterable record of truth, an imperishable witness of creeds. It is right that the very walls should have an expression and an eloquence for the eye, for the eye has as great a claim to an exalted usage as the ear, and if that may without objection be the vehicle of the mind of truth—the channel by which the religious orator pours in his flood of refined speech,—so

* See vol. xi. p. 211.